

From: Miyamoto, Faith
To: 'baizas@infraconsultllc.com'; 'Spurgeon, Lawrence'; 'Roberts, Stephanie L'
Sent: 2/12/2009 8:22:49 AM
Subject: FW: Honolulu Transit Project DEIS

Redacted

-----Original Message-----

From: Ted.Matley@dot.gov [mailto:Ted.Matley@dot.gov]
Sent: Sunday, February 08, 2009 4:13 PM
To: Miyamoto, Faith
Subject: FW: Honolulu Transit Project DEIS

From: Cinnie Frith [mailto:cfrith@fbsmgt.com]
Sent: Fri 2/6/2009 7:59 PM
To: Matley, Ted <FTA>
Subject: FW: Honolulu Transit Project DEIS

Mr Matley,

I would like to comment on a few of my many concerns about this project that are not covered to my satisfaction in the DEIS. My two main concerns have always centered around cost as it pertains to projected usage and available jobs for Hawaiian workers.

As to costs, touched upon in Chapter 1, what if we go "over budget" or we don't receive the federal money as expected? What if the increased GET tax is not enough to pay for the citizen's portion of the project? What if ridership does not materialize as anticipated? What if all of your mitigation efforts, which are very poorly explained throughout the report, do not work well enough to "mitigate"?

In Chapter 2 of the report on page 5 you state-"The managed lane alternative would not have supported the planned concentrated future population and employment growth because it would not provide concentrations of transit service that would serve as a nucleus for TOD". This statement reminds me of the tail wagging the dog, in that I was under the distinct impression that this project was to relieve traffic congestion, and not the other way around! What is the source used for stating that there are "no funding sources" for this alternative?

On page 13 of Chapter 2, you talk about "committed congestion- a relief project in the Oahu Regional Transportation Plan 2030. Can you expand on the meaning of this project? Did I also read correctly that there was need for a traction power substation EVERY MILE? On page 38 they talk about the provision for vehicular propulsion and auxilliary power to be housed in a steel "box" with dimensions of 40'long by 16'wide by 12"wide! Were will they be located and how will they be protected as they will contain transformers, rectifiers, batteries and ventilation-all connected to an existing electrical grid?

On page 39 of Chapter 2, you do address use of the "local" work force, stating that one of the reasons for the phase approach to the entire project is to "match the rate of construction to what can be maintained with the local workforce and resources". Can you elaborate on the skill level needed for much of this project and if the work force has the capacity to take on such a huge and daunting task? Again, I sense the tail is wagging the dog!

On to Chapter 3 page 2-What is an on board transit survey? It appears that one was completed and became part of the OMPO travel demand forecasting model which was used to "predict" future traffic conditions and Transit ridership. Then on page 26 it is stated that "under any build alternative average travel time on transit would improve dramatically, enhancing overall

mobility and accessibility". Is this statement inclusive of all time getting from point A(initial departure) to point B(final destination)? Then you go on to say,"In some cases, transit travel times would be 1/2 of today's time". Could you give a specific example?

Page 28-table 3-5 really has me confused! Station to station travel times with down time are clearly stated in columns, but two of the columns are missing 7 stats/times and the other two are missing 5stats/times. How can you come up with a realistic total when you're missing so much information? I must also state that I have never believed for one moment that the down time at each station was realistic to what is needed for people to get on and off any form of public transportation SAFELY.

Chapter 3 page 37 states that there will be no reduction of the number of roadway lanes upon completion of the project (table 3-21), but as I continued through this section to page 43 I was alarmed to realize that some areas would loose their 4' bike lanes and have to co-mingle. with traffic on a shared lane that was now downsized to 14' wide. Other areas would see more narrow sidewalks with pedestrians having less space. It would appear we're robbing Peter(The people) to pay Paul(The train), and it feels like a very slippery slope for public safety.

Finally-pages 48-50 talk about a Traffic Plan on how you minimize construction effects, but is there a plan in place? The same question is asked about a Transit Mitigation Plan-is there one in place?

My concerns do continue, especially where the esthetics of this project are concerned. In your initial summary on page 6 you talk about this project as "trying to enhance the visual and esthetic opportunities that it creates". Looking beyond the horrendous cost and all the political wheeling and dealing, I hate to see this beautiful island blighted with this "steel elephant" and our grandchildren choked with a financial burden they do not deserve nor can ill afford.

Cynthia Frith